

REMARKS

Claims 59 to 150 were pending in the application at the time of issuance of the advisory action. Claims 59 to 61, 63 to 69, 71 to 79, 81 to 87, 89 to 95, 97, 99 to 101, 103 to 115, 117 to 129, 131 to 143, and 145 to 150 stand rejected as anticipated. Claims 62, 70, 80, 88, 98, 102, 116, 130, and 144 stand rejected as obvious.

Claims 59, 77, 95, and 123 are amended to explicitly recite that the inlining of data eliminates the need for the reference to the information in the constant pool. While in Applicants' opinion this amendment should be unnecessary when the claims are read in view of the specification as required by the MPEP, the amendment is presented to move the prosecution forward. Since the amendment recites the result of the operation previously recited in the claims the amendments should not affect the patentability of this claims.

Claims 69, 87, 109, and 137 are amended to explicitly recite that execution of the composite instruction of data eliminates the need for the sequential execution of two or more other instructions. Again, while in Applicants' opinion this amendment should be unnecessary when the claims are read in view of the specification as required by the MPEP, the amendment is presented to move the prosecution forward. Since the amendment recites the result previously recited in the claims the amendments should not affect the patentability of this claims.

In the advisory action, the Examiner maintained the objection to Claims 109 and 137 for informalities. Applicants respectfully note that when "the" is inserted in a claim before an element, the use of "the" signals that the element is the same as an element previously recited in the claims that provides an antecedent basis for the element following "the." The only other possible basis is that the element is inherent

in a previously recited element. In Claims 109 and 137, there is no prior recitation related to execution either explicitly or inherently. Thus, the amendment would create an antecedent basis and so Applicants respectfully submit that the suggested change would create an informality rather correct an antecedent basis informality. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to each of Claims 109, and 137.

Claims 59 to 61, 63 to 69, 71 to 79, 81 to 87, 89 to 95, 97, 99 to 101, 103 to 115, 117 to 129, 131 to 143, and 145 to 150 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,308,317, hereinafter referred to as Wilkinson.

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of each of independent Claims 59, 77, 95, and 123 and incorporate the prior remarks herein by reference. Constant pool 47 is a constant pool. In contrast, Claim 59 recites that the reference to the information is eliminated because the data has been inlined and consequently, it is unnecessary to access any constant pool to obtain the information. Accordingly, the two constant pools of Wilkinson fails to teach or suggest the inlining as recited in Claim 59. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 59.

Claims 60, 62, and 63 to 68 depend from Claim 59 and so distinguish over Wilkinson for at least the same reasons as Claim 59. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 60, 62, and 63 to 68.

Claim 69 stands rejected as anticipated by Wilkinson also. The comments in the advisory action further demonstrate that Wilkinson has not been properly interpreted. First, Wilkinson taught that instructions like ILOAD_x were translated so that it was not necessary to execute such instructions in the Java

Card environment. As noted previously in the portions of pages 252 and 253 of Lindholm and Yellin, The Java™ Virtual Machine Specification, Sun Microsystems, Inc., Santa Clara, California, 1997, both ILOAD_x and ILOAD are single instructions and comments about either being a composite instruction as recited in Claim 69 is not based upon any citation in Wilkinson.

Wilkinson expressly taught why the ILOAD_X instruction was translated to an ILOAD instruction, i.e.,

This translation is done to reduce the number of byte codes translated by the Card JVM 16, consequently reducing the complexity and code space requirements for the Card JVM 16. (Emphasis Added)

Wilkinson, Col. 10, lines 44 to 47.

The reason had nothing to do with forming a composite instruction, but rather was simply reducing the number of byte codes translated according to Wilkinson. Thus, the rationale for the rejection is inconsistent with the explicit teaching of Wilkinson.

The ILOAD_X instruction is an instruction for a single load operation as is the ILOAD instruction for a particular location X. This is expressly stated in The Java Virtual Machine Specification as quoted above. Accordingly, translating an ILOAD_X instruction to an ILOAD instruction, and executing the ILOAD instruction in the JAVA CARD environments results in a single load operation being performed. The execution of either of the load instructions fails to teach a composite instruction as recited in Claim 69. Neither instruction replaces the sequential execution of two instructions on an object with a single instruction that obtains the same result. Rather, at most it teaches replacing a load instruction with a pointer defined in the instruction with an instruction in which the pointer must be explicitly provided. This fails to teach exactly what is recited in

Claim 69. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 69.

Claims 71 to 76 depend from Claim 69 and so distinguish over Wilkinson for at least the same reasons as Claim 69. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 71 to 76.

Claim 77 is directed to a resource-constrained device that includes a conversion equivalent to that of Claim 59, as discussed above and incorporated herein by reference. Therefore, Claim 77 distinguishes over Wilkinson for at least the same reasons as Claim 59. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 77.

Claims 78, 79 and 81 to 86 depend from Claim 77 and so distinguish over Wilkinson for at least the same reasons as Claim 77. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 78, 79 and 81 to 86.

Claim 87 is directed to a resource-constrained device that includes a composite instruction equivalent to that of Claim 69, as discussed above and incorporated herein by reference. Therefore, Claim 87 distinguishes over Wilkinson for at least the same reasons as Claim 69. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 87.

Claims 89 to 94 depend from Claim 87 and so distinguish over Wilkinson for at least the same reasons as Claim 87. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 89 to 94.

Claim 96 is directed to a method of using an application software program that includes a conversion equivalent to that of Claim 59, as discussed above and incorporated herein by reference. Therefore, Claim 96 distinguishes over Wilkinson for at least the same reasons as Claim 59. Applicants

respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 96.

Claims 97, 99 to 101, and 103 to 108 depend from Claim 96 and so distinguish over Wilkinson for at least the same reasons as Claim 96. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 97, 99 to 101, and 103 to 108.

Claim 109 is directed to a method of using an application software program that includes a composite instruction equivalent to that of Claim 69, as discussed above and incorporated herein by reference. Therefore, Claim 109 distinguishes over Wilkinson for at least the same reasons as Claim 69. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 109.

Claims 110 to 115, and 117 to 122 depend from Claim 109 and so distinguish over Wilkinson for at least the same reasons as Claim 109. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 110 to 115, and 117 to 122.

Claim 123 is directed to an apparatus that includes a conversion equivalent to that of Claim 59, as discussed above and incorporated herein by reference. Therefore, Claim 123 distinguishes over Wilkinson for at least the same reasons as Claim 59. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 123.

Claims 124 to 129 and 131 to 136 depend from Claim 123 and so distinguish over Wilkinson for at least the same reasons as Claim 123. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 124 to 129 and 131 to 136.

Claim 137 is directed to an apparatus that includes a composite instruction equivalent to that of Claim 69, as discussed above and incorporated herein by reference. Therefore, Claim 137 distinguishes over Wilkinson for at least

the same reasons as Claim 69. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 137.

Claims 138 to 143 and 145 to 150 depend from Claim 137 and so distinguish over Wilkinson for at least the same reasons as Claim 109. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 138 to 143 and 145 to 150.

Claims 67, 70, 80, 88, 96, 98, 102, 116, 130 and 144 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Wilkinson in view of official notice.

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 67, 70, 80, 88, 96, 98, 102, 116, 130 and 144. Assuming arguendo that use of Official Notice is appropriate, the additional information noted fails to correct the defects in Wilkinson as noted above for the independent claims for which these claims depend. Thus, each of Claims 67, 70, 80, 88, 96, 98, 102, 116, 130 and 144 distinguish over the combination of references for at least the same reasons as the independent claim from which each depends. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of each of Claims 67, 70, 80, 88, 96, 98, 102, 116, 130 and 144.

//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//

Appl. No. 09/243,101
Amdt. dated November 7, 2005
Reply to Advisory Action of October 6, 2005

Claims 59 to 150 remain in the application. Claims 59, 77, 95 and Claims 69, 87, 109, and 137 have been amended. Claims 1 to 58 were previously canceled. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant(s) respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on November 7, 2005.



Attorney for Applicant(s)

November 7, 2005
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Forrest Gunnison
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32,899
Tel.: (831) 655-0880